IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

THURSDAY, THE NINTH DAY OF SEPTEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N.V. RAMANA

WRIT PETITION NO : 24085 of 1995

Between:

Pallanti Venkata Ramesh son of Venkata Ramana,

aged 27 years, resident of Kothapet, Rajahmundry,

Eas Godavari District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1.TheCommissioner,Prohibition and Excise,Andhra Pradesh, Nampalli, Hyderabad.

2.The Deputy Commissioner Prohibition and Excise Kakinada, East Godavari District,

3.The Inspector,Prohibition and Excise, Ramchandrapuram, East Godavari District.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue an appropriate writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the 2nd respondent in confiscating the petitioner's car bearing registration No. AP 5/T 7163 in proceedings R.C.No.B1/2382/95, dated 25-8-1995, as illegal, arbitrary and in violation of principles of natural justice and consequently direct the 2nd respondent not to confiscate the petitioner's car bearing registration No.AP 5/T 7163, pending disposal of the appeal preferred before the 1st respondent .

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.K.VENKATESH

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 to 3: GP FOR PROHIBITION & EXCISE

The Court made the following :

.....

ORAL ORDER:

This writ petition is filed seeking a direction to the respondents not confiscate the vehicle of the petitioner.

When the matter came up today for hearing, none appears for the petitioners.

This Court while admitting the writ petition directed the respondents by order dated 27-10-1995 not to confiscate the vehicle of the petitioner, pending disposal of the writ petition, subject to the condition of the petitioner keeping the bank guarantee alive. By lapse of time, the cause in this writ petition has become infructuous, inasmuch as the petitioner was seeking a direction to the respondents not confiscate his vehicle pursuant to the proceedings dated 25-8-1995 issued by the 2nd respondent and he had preferred an appeal also against the said order.

Therefore, the writ petition is dismissed as having become infructuous. No costs.

_____

9-9-2004

ASP

To

1.The Commissioner, Prohibition and Excise, Andhra Pradesh, Nampalli, Hyderabad.

2.The Deputy Commissioner Prohibition and Excise Kakinada, East Godavari District,

3.The Inspector, Prohibition and Excise, Ramchandrapuram, East Godavari District.

4. Two C.Cs. to G.P. for Prohibition and Excise, High Court Buildings, Hyderabad (O.U.T)

4..2CD copies